UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Case No. 25-3497

Jonathan Daniel Clements,
Appellant-Plaintiff,

v.

State of Arkansas, et al.,
Appellees-Defendants.

EMERGENCY MOTION TO ENFORCE JURISDICTIONAL DIVESTITURE AND PREVENT RETALIATORY ARREST BY NAMED INFERIOR PARTIES

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT:

Appellant Jonathan Daniel Clements, appearing pro se and as Executor and Sovereign Equity Holder of ECC-TRUST-JDC-005, respectfully moves this Honorable Court for emergency protection and enforcement of jurisdictional authority against imminent retaliatory arrest and judicial misconduct by parties named in this appeal.

I. STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

This Court has jurisdiction under **28 U.S.C. § 1291** and **28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act)** to supervise and enforce its authority over cases and controversies properly before it, and to prevent obstruction of justice, interference with appellate review, or retaliatory action against an appellant.

BACKGROUND

Appellant filed a formal appeal to this Court concerning jurisdictional overreach, federal RICO violations, and equity enforcement involving the Booneville District Court, Logan County Sheriff's Department, Booneville Police Department, and related officials.

On **November 20, 2025**, Appellant presented official federal filings including the Notice of Appeal and Notice of Jurisdictional Stay from the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to the Booneville District Court. The clerk refused to accept the documents and stated, "this case has nothing to do with the appeals court," despite the named parties being directly involved.

On the same date, Appellant was **compelled by the Booneville judge to enter a plea** under duress, despite the active federal appeal. Appellant pled "not guilty" under protest.

Appellant completed **certified mailing** of the same documents to Booneville following the refusal.

On **January 5, 2026**, Appellant again personally delivered the **Notice of Jurisdictional Stay**, already docketed with this Court, to the Booneville clerk. **The filing was again refused**, establishing a pattern of defiance against this Court's jurisdiction.

Appellant has received **credible notice that Booneville intends to proceed with arrest or other retaliatory action on or about January 9, 2026**, based on the same underlying citations and parties now under appellate review.

All parties were served with the appeal and relevant notices via certified mail, with return receipt confirmations. The Booneville Court has failed to acknowledge the divestiture of jurisdiction.

Appellant has submitted a **Supplemental Notice to the Court**, detailing the pattern of refusal, forced plea, and anticipated enforcement. No response has yet been entered.

III. LEGAL BASIS FOR RELIEF

This Court retains full supervisory authority over inferior courts under its jurisdiction, and may issue orders to:

Protect its jurisdiction from being frustrated by inferior tribunals (see *N.L.R.B. v. Cuny Packaging Corp.*, 119 F.3d 1170 (8th Cir. 1997));

Prevent retaliatory or contemptuous action under **18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242**;

Enforce jurisdictional divestiture doctrine (*Griggs v. Provident Consumer Discount Co.*, 459 U.S. 56 (1982));

Apply emergency relief under the **All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)**;

Recognize ecclesiastical and trust jurisdiction when such jurisdiction has been properly published, served, and entered into default, including international publication and public notice.

Further, Appellant is the **lawful executor and global equity holder under ECC-TRUST-JDC-005**, an ecclesiastical, international, and private trust body with documented jurisdiction over all assets and conveyances lawfully placed within its domain, including the underlying matter.

This Trust was published globally, served across platforms, and entered into **legal and ecclesiastical default** on **August 15, 2025**, after the expiration of both the 21-day rebuttal window and extended grace period. No lawful challenge, rebuttal, or claim was filed.

Any enforcement action now taken by an inferior court **after that default** constitutes not only:

Judicial misconduct under federal rules,

But **direct violation of settled trust equity, ecclesiastical sovereignty, and the law of nations**.

The Booneville court and its officers have no lawful jurisdiction over Appellant, his property, or his trust conveyances.

IV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Court:

Acknowledge that appellate jurisdiction has fully divested Booneville District Court of authority in this matter;

Issue a formal order or directive prohibiting any arrest, enforcement, or judicial action by the Booneville District Court, its agents, or affiliates, **while this appeal is pending**;

Confirm that any enforcement action taken by inferior parties **after notice, after default, and after appeal has been accepted** constitutes:

Obstruction of justice under federal law,

Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and trust equity,

Retaliation against a sovereign trust executor and appellant under protection of this Court;

Warn that any such action may result in civil and criminal liability under federal, ecclesiastical, and international law;

And grant any additional or alternative relief this Court deems just and proper to preserve jurisdictional integrity and protect the life, liberty, and legal standing of the Appellant.

Respectfully submitted,
Jonathan Daniel Clements
Appellant, Pro Se
Executor, ECC-TRUST-JDC-005
Date: January 5, 2026